

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The objection to cannister because of its spelling with two n's rather than one n. Applicant has consistently used that word in the specification and the claims and therefore believes that spelling may be retained.

Claims 17 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 17 has been corrected from the second spool region to the unexposed spool region, consistent with now independent claim 3. Claim 27 has been canceled making this rejection moot.

Before turning to the claim rejections, all of claims 3-15, 21, 24, 25, 30, 31 would be allowable and claims 33-37 are allowed. Formerly dependent claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form incorporating therein the limitations of claims 1 and 2 on which claim 3 had been dependent. Claims 4-15 are all directly or indirectly dependent upon claim 3 and should be allowed. Claim 21 is in independent form including therein the limitations of claim 1. Claim 24 is in independent form including therein the limitations of claims 22 and 23. Claim 25 is dependent upon claim 24. Claim 30 is in independent form including therein the limitations of claim 22. Claim 31 is dependent upon claim 30. As the allowable claims have been amended, they should be allowed.

In addition to the allowed and allowable claims, rejected claim 16 has been amended to be dependent upon amended claim 3 and therefore allowable. Similarly, claim 17 has been amended to be dependent upon claim 3, as well as to overcome the § 112 rejection so that claim 17 should be allowed. Claim 19 has been amended to be dependent upon claim 3, whereby claim 19 should be allowed and dependent claim 20 should also be allowed.

Returning to the claim rejections, claims 1, 2, 16, 18-20 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled. Claims 16 and 18-20 have been made dependent upon claim 3 whereby this rejection of those claims has been rendered moot. Claim 32 is dependent upon claim 31, whereby in view of the allowability of claim 31, it is submitted that claim 32 should be allowable.

Claims 22, 23, 26, 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Those claims have been canceled.

In view of the amendments to the application and foregoing remarks, it is submitted that all of claims 2-21, 24, 25, and 30-37 remaining in the application should be allowed.

Note that applicant is also the inventor in U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/124,718, filed April 17, 2002 which is a continuation-in-part of the present application. In the event that the Examiner was not aware of the prior art cited during the examination of the companion CIP application, a copy of the Notice of References from the CIP application is attached hereto. The undersigned is unaware of whether any of the prior art cited in the CIP application is material to the examination of the present application.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office at facsimile No. 703-872-9318, on July 7, 2003:

Robert C. Faber

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Signature

July 7, 2003

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Robert C. Faber

Registration No.: 24,322

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

RCF:mjb

FAX RECEIVED
JUL 07 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800